

REMARKS

Claims 1 through 26 are currently pending in the application.

This amendment is in response to the Office Action of September 1, 2005.

Preliminary Amendment

Applicants note the filing of a Preliminary Amendment on November 10, 2003, which filing was not acknowledged in the outstanding Office Action. Should the Preliminary Amendment have failed to have been entered in the Office file, Applicants will provide a true copy to the Examiner.

35 U.S.C. § 112 Claim Rejections

Claims 14 through 19 and 21 through 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention.

Applicants have amended the claimed invention to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention to comply with the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 112. Therefore, presently amended claims 14 through 19 and 21 through 26 are allowable under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Double Patenting Rejections

Claims 1 through 11 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 through 16 of U.S. Patent 6,277,225.

Claims 1 through 11 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 through 12 of U.S. Patent 6,610,162.

Claims 12 through 26 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 through 17 of U.S. Patent 6,396,131.

Claims 12 through 26 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 through 17 of U.S. Patent 6,635,954. In order to avoid further expenses and time delay, Applicants elect to expedite the prosecution of

the present application by filing terminal disclaimers to obviate the double patenting rejections in compliance with 37 C.F.R. §1.321 (b) and (c). Applicants' filing of the terminal disclaimers should not be construed as acquiescence of the Examiner's double patenting or obviousness-type double patenting rejection. Attached are the terminal disclaimers and accompanying fee.

After carefully considering the cited prior art, the rejections, and the Examiner's comments, Applicants have amended the claimed invention to clearly distinguish over the cited prior art.

Applicants submit that claims 1 through 26 are clearly allowable over the cited prior art.

Applicants request the allowance of claims 1 through 26 and the case passed for issue.

Respectfully submitted,



James R. Duzan
Registration No. 28,393
Attorney for Applicants
TRASKBRITT
P.O. Box 2550
Salt Lake City, Utah 84110-2550
Telephone: 801-532-1922

Date: December 1, 2005

JRD/djp:lmh

Document in ProLaw